

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 15, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-8, 11 and 19-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the call control engine provides the host party with a meeting confirmation number associated with the future audio conference request, the call control engine changing or canceling the future audio conference request in response to receiving the meeting confirmation number with a request to change or cancel the future audio conference request." Support for this feature is found on at least page 11, line 21 – page 12, line 5 of Applicants' specification. None of Wu, Hogan and Culbreth teaches or suggests this feature. Accordingly, even if Wu, Hogan and Culbreth are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth. Claims 2-8, 11 and 25 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Independent claims 19, 23 and 26 include features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 20-22 depend upon claim 19 and are patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 19. Claim 24 depends upon claim 23 and is patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 23. Claims 27-28 depend upon claim 26 and are patentable over Wu in view of Hogan and Culbreth for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 26.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Hogan et al. and Culbreth and further in view of Roy. Roy was relied upon for disclosing that a host destination is an Internet Protocol (IP) address. Roy,

however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth in view of Roy for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Hogan et al. and Culbreth and further in view of Buskirk, Jr. Buskirk, Jr. was relied upon for disclosing that a host destination is an Internet Service Provider (ISP). Buskirk, Jr., however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu and Hogan and Culbreth as discussed above with reference to claim 26. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 26 and are patentable over Wu and Hogan and Culbreth in view of Buskirk, Jr. for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 26.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: October 16, 2006

00225 CON1
BLL-0025-C

10